

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Diana L. Parker

Application No.: 10/657,419

Confirmation No.: 9029

Filed: September 8, 2003

Art Unit: 1615

For: PESTICIDAL COMPOSITIONS AND
METHODS

Examiner: N. S. Levy

Certificate of Electronic Transmission (37 C.F.R. 1.8)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted via EFS-Web to: MS Amendment Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

February 13, 2009

By: /William C. Geary/

Date of Signature and Deposit

William C. Geary III
Attorney for Applicants

MS M Correspondence
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Madam:

**APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO
EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants submit this paper to clarify comments made by the Examiner in the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner to summarize the January 8, 2009 telephone interview.

The Examiner's comments characterizing the nature of the claimed invention and the Sedun reference are confusing. First, Applicants' note that the Examiner does not completely and accurately characterize the claimed invention. The claims accurately define the invention.

With regard to the Sedun reference, the Examiner's summary of the interview is not clear. The Response filed on January 14, 2009, more clearly and accurately reflects the points made

during the interview to distinguish the Sedun reference from the claimed invention. Indeed, before addressing the points of rejection, page 5 of the Response notes that the "§ 102(e) rejection was also discussed during the interview and for the reasons discussed below."

Dated: February 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /William C. Geary III/
William C. Geary III
Registration No.: 31,359
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604
(617) 439-2766
(617) 310-9766 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant